

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	No. C08-5023 MMC (BZ)
	)	
v.	)	
	)	<b>ORDER DENYING CLAIMANT'S</b>
	)	<b>MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER</b>
APPROXIMATELY \$57,378 IN	)	<b>AND GRANTING GOVERNMENT'S</b>
UNITED STATES CURRENCY,	)	<b>MOTION TO COMPEL</b>
	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

Claimant Kap Suk Sims' son was arrested in the Northern District of California with \$57,378. In a plea agreement with the Government, he admitted that he intended to use the \$57,378 to purchase marijuana and agreed to forfeit the money. Sims, who resides and works in the Northern District of Georgia, filed a claim of ownership in this Court to her son's forfeited money.<sup>1</sup> As part of this civil proceeding, the Government noticed Sims' deposition to take place in San Francisco, California. Sims seeks a protective order so that

---

<sup>1</sup> In a third-party claim of ownership proceeding, the burden is on Sims to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she has a legitimate ownership interest in the \$57,378. 21 U.S.C. § 853(n)(6).

1 she could either be deposed by telephone, by video conference,  
2 or in Atlanta, Georgia. Docket No. 34. The Government  
3 opposes these requests and has moved to compel Sims'  
4 appearance in San Francisco. Docket No. 38. For the reasons  
5 explained below, I order Sims to travel to San Francisco for  
6 her deposition.

7 Subject to a protective order, party depositions may be  
8 noticed wherever the deposing party designates. U.S. v.  
9 \$160,066.98, 202 F.R.D. 624, 627 (S.D. Cal. 2001). Usually, a  
10 party's deposition is taken in the district the deponent works  
11 or resides. *Id.* at 626 (citations omitted). I may grant a  
12 protective order if there is good cause to limit discovery and  
13 protect a deponent from "annoyance, embarrassment, oppression,  
14 or undue burden or expense." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1). The  
15 issue is therefore whether it is unduly burdensome or  
16 expensive for her to travel to San Francisco. See U.S. v.  
17 \$160,066.98, 202 F.R.D. at 626. In evaluating this, I am free  
18 to consider the convenience and relative hardships of both  
19 parties. *Id.* See also Hyde & Drath v. Baker, 24 F.3d 1162,  
20 1166 (9th Cir. 1994) (courts have "wide discretion to  
21 establish" the deposition's location).

22 Initially, I asked the Government to explain in its  
23 opposition why it could not depose Sims (1) by telephone or  
24 video conference, or (2) in Atlanta with the assistance of a  
25 Government attorney from the Northern District of Georgia.  
26 The Government asserts that each of the above options are not  
27 suitable for this deposition. Because of the circumstances in  
28 this case, I agree and find that Sims must be deposed in

1 person.

2 A deposition by telephone or video conference would be  
3 prejudicial to the Government's case. This is primarily  
4 because the Government will use Sims' deposition to examine  
5 her credibility.<sup>2</sup> To do this, the Government needs an in-  
6 person opportunity to observe Sims' demeanor, ask follow-up  
7 questions, and confront Sims with prior inconsistent  
8 statements she has made. See U.S. v. \$160,066.98, 202 F.R.D.  
9 at 630 (counsel would be "disadvantaged without the  
10 opportunity to see the witness and to evaluate the witness'  
11 demeanor, facial reactions and expressions") (internal  
12 citations and quotations omitted). The Government also  
13 requires Sims to examine multiple exhibits, including tax  
14 returns and bank statements, during the deposition. Managing  
15 this process is a particular concern because Sims is  
16 representing herself and her English is limited. Due to these  
17 reasons, an in-person deposition is necessary because a  
18 deposition by telephone would be meaningless and a deposition  
19 by video conference would be impracticable.

20 It would also not be efficient to have a Government  
21 attorney from the Northern District of Georgia participate in  
22 the deposition of Sims in Atlanta. This attorney would have

---

23 <sup>2</sup> Sims' credibility is an issue in this case. In her  
24 son's criminal proceedings, he admitted under oath that the  
25 \$57,378 was to be used for purchasing drugs. But in this  
26 ancillary forfeiture proceeding, Sims' son has recanted his  
27 admission and testified at his deposition that the money was  
28 his mother's. Both Sims and her son now claim that he  
traveled to California only to buy restaurant equipment on  
Craigslis for Sim's business. In September 2010, Sims' son  
was arrested in another matter. Similar to this case, he  
claimed that the \$15,000 he had in his possession was given to  
him by his mother so he could purchase a car.

1 to invest too much time to learn about the factual details of  
2 this case in order to conduct a meaningful deposition of Sims  
3 or assist in a video conference deposition. Rather than do  
4 this, it would be more efficient for the Government's attorney  
5 from the Northern District of California to travel to Atlanta  
6 and conduct the deposition. The issue therefore becomes  
7 whether it is appropriate to require Sims to travel to San  
8 Francisco or to have a Government attorney travel to Atlanta.

9 In evaluating the factors for both sides, I find that it  
10 is more just to have Sims travel to San Francisco for the  
11 deposition. This is not the usual proceeding where it is  
12 customary for individuals to be deposed in the district of  
13 their residence or work. Rather, Sims has purposefully  
14 submitted to this Court's jurisdiction by filing her third-  
15 party ownership claim to money that has already been  
16 forfeited. In similar third-party forfeiture challenges,  
17 other courts have required claimants to travel outside their  
18 home forum for depositions due to the nature of the claim.  
19 See U.S. v. \$160,066.98, 202 F.R.D. at 627-29 (holding that  
20 the claimants inconvenience and expense associated with the  
21 prosecution of their claim in the Southern District of  
22 California were foreseeable and are not undue in comparison  
23 with the Government's burdens); U.S. v. Real Property Located  
24 at Layton, 2010 WL 3271959 (D. Utah 2010). Sims does not  
25 provide any case authority that requires the Government to  
26 incur expenses in traveling to depose out-of-state claimants  
27 in civil forfeiture actions like this. Instead, she argues  
28 the above cases are not analogous because unlike those

1 claimants she did not earn money or conduct any business in  
2 the Northern District of California. I am not persuaded by  
3 this. Sims claims that she gave \$57,378 to her son for him to  
4 travel to San Francisco and purchase restaurant equipment.  
5 Assuming this is true, Sims intended to conduct business in  
6 the Northern District of California. Moreover, it is Sims'  
7 decision to continue the prosecution of her claim of ownership  
8 in this proceeding.

9 It is also not unduly burdensome for Sims to travel to  
10 San Francisco and pay for her expenses. Sims traveled to San  
11 Francisco on March 19, 2010 for a status conference in this  
12 matter. She did not indicate that she had any travel  
13 anxieties at this time.<sup>3</sup> Sims also does not declare that she  
14 is need of financial assistance or is unable to afford the  
15 expenses associated with this deposition. Since she claims  
16 she had \$57,378 available to invest in her business, she  
17 appears to have disposable income. See U.S. v. Real Property  
18 Located at Layton, 2010 WL 3271959 at \*3 (finding that the  
19 Government in a civil forfeiture proceeding should not pay  
20 claimant's deposition travel costs because he has failed to  
21 demonstrate undue burden or expense). Moreover, as explained  
22 in the previous paragraph, I find that the Government should  
23 not be forced to incur significant expenses to depose a third-  
24 party claimant that has not persuaded me she has a meritorious  
25 claim in a civil forfeiture proceeding.

26 For the foregoing reasons, **IT IS ORDERED** that Sims'

---

27 <sup>3</sup> Besides a self-serving declaration, Sims has not  
28 provided any evidence corroborating her anxieties about  
traveling to California.

1 motion for a protective order is **DENIED**, and the Government's  
2 motion to compel is **GRANTED**. Sims must travel to San  
3 Francisco for her deposition at her own expense. **IT IS**  
4 **FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties shall meet and confer by  
5 **November 2, 2010** to determine a suitable date for Sims'  
6 deposition.

7 Dated: October 27, 2010



8  
9  
Bernard Zimmerman  
United States Magistrate Judge

10 G:\BZALL\REFS\USA V. APPROX \$57,378\ORDER DENYING CLAIMANT'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER.wpd  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28